

ARTICLE APPEARED  
ON PAGE B-11

WASHINGTON POST  
27 July 1984

## JACK ANDERSON

### CIA Official Returned Favor To Hill Critics

The CIA and Congress, now locked in bitter conflict over the agency's "covert" operations in Central America, have always had an uneasy relationship at best. While members of Congress have been free with their criticism of the CIA, it is rare for a CIA official to express in return equally candid assessments of his paymasters on Capitol Hill.

Now I can reveal just what a pillar of the CIA's old-boy network thought of the legislators with whom he had to deal. The blistering appraisal is contained in a 14-page report, "CIA and the Congress," which was disseminated in one of the agency's secret publications. It was intended as a sort of guideline for CIA employees trying to "handle" Congress.

My associate Dale Van Atta has reviewed the report, which was written by the late John Minor Maury, a Virginian who served as a Marine Corps officer in World War II and was the CIA station chief in Athens in the 1960s and 1970s. He later served as congressional liaison for the CIA and the Pentagon.

Maury's disdain for the people's

representatives is laid out right at the start.

He quotes the 18th century French playwright, Pierre de Beaumarchais:

"To be a politician is but to feign ignorance of what you know well, pretend knowledge of what you are totally ignorant, decline to listen to what you hear, attempt what is beyond your capacity, hide what ought to be exposed, appear profound when you are dull-witted and to justify ignoble means by claiming admirable ends."

The author's opinion of members of Congress is equally uncharitable. "They are, to be sure, not all equipped for the role of statesmen," he wrote. "Among them are a fair number of dull fellows who instinctively distrust brilliance."

Maury's assessment is that "in the main we have a group of broadly representative Americans struggling to find a tolerable compromise between the demands of their constituents, the pressures of the media and special interest groups, horse-trading bargains offered by their colleagues and the dictates of their consciences."

Then he added, "In the case of some, to resolve such conflicts on the basis of the limited mental and moral resources with which the Creator has seen fit to endow them must indeed be a formidable task, the results of which one should not judge too harshly."

Maury cites a few horrible exam-

ples of Capitol Hill fauna: the "distinguished member" who could never keep straight Libya, Lebanon and Liberia; older members who have short attention spans "and particularly in afternoon sessions are prone to intermittent dozing," and the elderly committee chairman who confused "paramilitary" with "parliamentary" operations.

Despite these formidable shortcomings, the report warned, many members of Congress "have an uncanny knack for asking simple and direct questions . . . that go right to the heart of the issues involved," as well as "an uncanny sense for detecting a snow job."

To handle congressmen who want to reveal secrets instead of waiting to be scooped by the press, Maury recommends this subtle bit of ego-stroking:

"It may be useful to point out the difference between a revelation by a Jack Anderson . . . and a revelation by a responsible member of the Armed Services Committee . . . . If I thought the KGB spent its time trying to analyze and evaluate every story put out by Jack Anderson, I wouldn't worry too much. But when a senior member of the Armed Services or Foreign Relations Committee appears on 'Meet the Press' and talks about how much we know about Soviet missiles or submarines, odds are that the KGB assumes he's basing his comments on the best available intelligence information."